

**Den Hollander Decl.  
Exhibit I**

PAUL W. STEINBERG  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
14 EAST FOURTH STREET  
NEW YORK, NY 10012-1141

(212) 529-5400

PAULSTEINBERG@NYSBAR.COM

Hon. Frederic Block  
United States District Court, E.D.N.Y.  
225 Cadman Plaza East  
Brooklyn NY 11201-1818

November 11, 2008

RE: Roy Den Hollander v. Deborah Swindells Donovan, et. al.  
# 08-CV-4045 (FB) (CLP)

Dear Judge Block:

I am a named Defendant in the above-titled matter. I write to request a pre-motion conference to permit me to file a motion to dismiss.


Defendant Deborah S. Donovan is represented by Ms. Krebs of Gordon & Rees, which has submitted a letter to this court; Ms. Krebs' letter of November 6 sets forth in detail three sound bases for a motion to dismiss, and in the interest of brevity I will respectfully refer the court to Ms. Krebs' analysis.

I would only add that the point raised by Ms. Krebs regarding statements made by counsel in legal proceedings is a valid concern, particularly in instances where there is a vexatious plaintiff with a documented history of pursuing litigation against attorneys who defeat him.

Just as Ms. Donovan submitted portions of Mr. Den Hollander's blog in connection with litigation in federal litigation initiated by Mr. Den Hollander, I submitted portions of the same blog in connection with state court litigation initiated by Mr. Den Hollander (NY Cty Civ. Ct. # 021283/06). That litigation originated as a defamation action against me for statements made in pleadings submitted on behalf of my client (NY Supreme # 116711/2003). Specifically, in response to the defamation action, I addressed matters relating to Mr. Den Hollander's motivation in bringing suit and also concern for the physical protection of parties whom Mr. Den Hollander was seeking to join in the action. I would also note that I assumed representation in the NY Supreme matter after Mr. Den Hollander brought a motion to discipline my client's previous counsel (the motion was denied by Justice Madden).

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul Steinberg  
Defendant *pro se*

Civil Court of the City of New York  
111 Centre Street  
New York, NY 10013  
=====


Register #: N1      Receipt No.: 107997

Index Number: 21283 NCV 2006  
HOLLANDER vs. FASANO

FEE: \$6.00 Paid      November 25, 2009

Certification Of A Document

I, Jack Baer, Chief Clerk, do hereby  
certify that I have compared the  
attached copy with the original document  
on file in my office and that it is a  
correct and complete transcript of the  
original.

  
JACK BAER, Chief Clerk  
No. of Pages: 9      by: [Signature]

PCR 11-25-09 MAC/12:56

KEEP THIS RECEIPT WITH YOUR COURT PAPERS

/

CIVIL COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK  
COUNTY OF NEW YORK

-----X  
Roy DEN HOLLANDER,

Plaintiff,

Index # 021283 / 06 CIV


AFFIRMATION IN OPPOSITION

-against-

William FASANO, Paul STEINBERG,  
PETER COOPER VILLAGE/STUYVESANT TOWN,  
Jill BLANCHARD, Donalda HABERSHAM  
Defendants.  
-----X

Paul Steinberg, an attorney duly admitted to practice law in the State of New York, hereby affirms pursuant to CPLR 2106:


1. I am the attorney for defendant William Fasano in the above-captioned action.
2. Defendant Fasano is the upstairs neighbor of Plaintiff Den Hollander.
3. I am a named defendant in the above-captioned action, and as such have personal knowledge of the facts in addition to information provided to me by my client Mr. Fasano.
4. The basis for your Affirmant being named as a party is that Plaintiff Den Hollander is claiming that statements made by your Affirmant in court pleadings were defamatory.
5. As this court is aware, statements made in pleadings are privileged. Moreover, these statements were made in a matter before Justice Madden in New York County Supreme Court, and those statements in the pleadings were also discussed in proceedings before Justice Madden and remain in the public record of the proceedings.
6. The instant Motion of Plaintiff Den Hollander is essentially the same as the Plaintiff's previous Motion.
7. We have previously responded to the Plaintiff's arguments in our Affirmation In Opposition dated May 18, 2007; there has been no change in statute or caselaw on these matters in the last 5 months, and we have annexed our previous response at **Exhibit A**.
8. The only new matter raised is that Plaintiff Den Hollander takes offense at paragraphs 31-33 of our previous response; we raised concerns as to the physical well-being of persons who were involved and prospectively involved in this case.
9. As discussed previously (see **Exhibit B**), records of the Landlord submitted in a previous NY County Supreme Court action show that Plaintiff Den Hollander has argued with his neighbors



certification of document  
NOV 25 2009  
1-25-09  
Index #: 021283 NOV 2006  
107997

since 1995, and that as far back as 1998 the neighbors had expressed concern about Plaintiff's mental stability and felt threatened by Plaintiff Den Hollander.

10. As far back as November 17, 1998, Mr. Fasano (defendant in this case) expressed concern about his physical well-being. Among the particular reasons was Mr. Den Hollander's issues with gender identity; those who do not fit Mr. Den Hollander's rigid gender roles (such as female judges and gay men) are particular targets of Den Hollander's anger; as an openly gay man, Mr. Fasano was and remains concerned about Den Hollander's obsession with Fasano's body.
11. By 2003, Plaintiff Den Hollander was writing in pleadings of Mr. Fasano's muscular physique and complaining that Mr. Fasano would not wear tight-fitting clothes to court. Understandably, Mr. Fasano was concerned about Mr. Den Hollander's obsession with Fasano's muscles and Mr. Den Hollander's fantasies about Fasano's bedroom habits and Plaintiff Den Hollander's demands in court pleadings that Fasano pay for Den Hollander's bedding.
12. By 2006, Plaintiff was writing a blog which was publicly accessible on the Internet, a sampling of his writing is appended hereto at **Exhibit C**.
13. In itself, the blog is troubling. Some of the discussion (such as how a man in Russia "can find some justice by slapping her around a bit", and the discussion of the Plaintiff's obsession with refrigerator doors opening) takes on greater import to those familiar with the Plaintiff's past history.
14. Plaintiff Den Hollander's discussion on September 2, 2006 of how a man can beat up, rape or kill a woman "providing no one else is present to prevent it" was a topic of some discussion among the Plaintiff's neighbors, and the subject of a conversation defense counsel had with Landlord's counsel.
15. Plaintiff's blog was apparently taken down shortly before Plaintiff Den Hollander embarked on his recent set of media appearances to rail against the evils of "ladies night" at local nightclubs; and his motion in federal court to have a judge recuse herself on the basis of her being a female.
16. While the media has portrayed Plaintiff Den Hollander as a harmless (albeit litigious) flake, we would submit that he is not only potentially dangerous, but has become more so with time.
17. Most recently, at the previous appearance to reschedule this matter, Plaintiff Den Hollander followed defense counsel Paul Steinberg down the hallway and physically assaulted him.
18. The legal insufficiency of Plaintiff's motion is a matter for this court to decide, and the matter before this court is virtually identical to Plaintiff's previous motion. What has changed in the interim is that Plaintiff Den Hollander, who had previously only exhibited threatening behavior to his neighbors, is now comfortable assaulting someone in the hallway of the courthouse.



19. Particularly given that Plaintiff Den Hollander can enter this courthouse without passing through security screening, the most recent evidence of violent tendencies should be of concern to this court, as it is to your Affiant.


Wherefore, Defendants respectfully request that this court deny Plaintiff Den Hollander's motion, grant other and further relief as this court deems just and proper, and that in the event this court does grant any relief to Plaintiff Den Hollander we respectfully request that this court take cognizance of the legitimate concerns for the physical safety of those who must come into contact with Plaintiff Den Hollander.

New York, NY

November 8, 2007



Paul Steinberg, Esq. (Rule 130.1-1)  
Atty for Defendants Steinberg & Fasano  
14 East 4<sup>th</sup> Street # 408  
New York NY 10012-1141  
(212) 529-5400





Saturday, September 02, 2006 11:56 AM

### Fear Corrupts

© Roy Den Hollander 2006

The purpose of the Feminist Movement is not equality, justice or freedom, but power—power over men. Virtually every female lives with a never-ending fear that just about any man has the physical power to do with her as he wishes. He can beat her up, rape or kill her with his bare hands, providing no one else is present to prevent it. She does, however, have recourse to the courts, and if she is dead, the prosecutor will try to avenge her, but when a female faces a man in a situation of imminent physical violence, she's powerless.

This lack of power to protect their own beings has driven many females to an uncontrollable fury and madness that has spawned a slithering, insidious, malicious obsession to control men totally by gutting their freedom of thought and speech and relegating them to the non-human status of beasts.

Feminists, or more appropriately Feminazis, use well-proven totalitarian tricks to reach this end. They propagandize their goal as liberation of all females, but in reality they aim to warp society's institutions into a big sister that relentlessly attacks, humiliates and demoralizes men.

The Feminazis profess their aim is to raise the consciousness of men and females, but they are actually carrying out a campaign of indoctrination and social pressure by assuming the role of scolding mothers or shrews. Their true goal is to domesticate men into sheepish little boys who will blindly obey their self-righteous, hypocritical and bigoted whims.

Having tasted social power, the Feminazis will not stop until they reshape America and eventually the world into an intolerant hell complete with thought-control, inquisitions, intimidation, enslavement and, as one Feminazi priestess advocated, a reduction in the male population to 10%. Perhaps the reduced male population will be kept in protective hamlets surrounded by armed guards and barbed wire where females can safely pick out their pleasure for the night and where females' fears remain entombed.

posted by [admin](#) with 0 Comments

Saturday, August 12, 2006 12:43 PM

### Two Sides


© Roy Den Hollander, 2006

When I worked for Metromedia TV News, now Fox News, there was only one way out of the newsroom and above that door was a sign: "Each story has two sides—make sure you get both." That maxim is no longer followed by the effete, eastern intellectual, white trash, elitist media.

Today, the fifth estate kowtows to the current, political-correctionalist propaganda of depicting females as victims and men as oppressors. The news media and Hollywood portray the role of wife as dreadful and that of the husband as enviable. As with other superficially, politically naive analyses, the Feminazi infested media often fails to look beyond its members own biased beliefs to the reality of being a husband in feminarchy America.

Everyday the husband leaves the house and children to trade 8, 10 or 12 hours of his life for the means to provide for his wife and offspring. Beyond food and housing, he must satiate her voracious appetite for material goods in her Sisyphean effort to keep up with Mrs. Jones; assuage her relentless vanity with expensive jewelry, perfumes, clothes and cosmetics; appease with social status her vindictive, vitriolic ranting as age lines her face; satisfy junior's whining for a new toy, bicycle or car; and fulfill his daughter's limitless greed for MTV hyped products.

At work, the husband must win out over others or jeopardize the means of satisfying his insatiable dependents. Job stress is an ever-present companion that contributes to the seven years shorter life span men have as compared to dames. Many husbands, however, do not have to worry about stress, because



their assigned role as serfs to princesses lands them in jobs that kill before stress has a chance to even raise their blood pressure. In the ten most hazardous jobs in America, over 90 percent of the workers are men. Every year industrial accidents kill twelve times more men than girls.

When an unfriendly nation decides to invade a husband's homeland, he, not his wife, will be drafted. The husband will go fight in order to protect his family and their way of life. In the twentieth century, 99 percent of the soldiers killed in wars were men. Perhaps death is the easy way for men to survive a war. Of the over two million young American men who served in Vietnam, approximately 800,000 suffer from post-traumatic stress syndrome. I wonder if any of these guys would have traded washing dishes for the hell they went through and are still suffering from.

In an emergency situation, females, including wives, and children are rescued first while men, including husbands, wait, hoping the grim reaper's scythe swings slowly enough for them to escape.

When the bottom of the economy falls out, the main provider of a family, usually the husband loses his job, which requires the family to seek government assistance. Some welfare programs require the husband to leave his home before the wife and children can receive support. As a result, the wife still has her children and a roof over her head while the husband walks the indifferent streets alone. Approximately 90 percent of America's three million homeless are men—not a few because of lost jobs stolen by broads.

At the other end of the economic scale where both husband and wife have well paying jobs, government and private support groups' discrimination against men has virtually no effect. But a form of male discrimination still exists. When the wife has a child, she often has the option to leave work to raise the child, to work part-time or return to work full-time. The husband also has three options: to continue working, to continue working and to continue working.

Finally, the burdens foisted on husbands and all men by this wo - man's nation cause men to commit suicide five times more often than females. For example, the Vietnam War killed around 58,000 young men; since that war's end, over 58,000 men who served in Vietnam have committed suicide.


When the Feminazis ask, "My God, who would want to be a wife?"

posted by [admin](#) with [1 Comments](#)

Saturday, August 12, 2006 12:25 PM

An Invisible Weapon

© Roy Den Hollander, 2006



Physical violence mainly injures the body while emotional distress sears the mind. Contemporary feminazi groups and the political-correctionalist media and politicians incessantly depict husbands and boyfriends as brutal batterers of their innocent, defenseless wives and concubines. Trendy beliefs claim that a large percentage of America's 50% divorce rate results from the genetically programmed physical violence of men against females. The media, populace and politicians, however, ignore the incapacitating genetically programmed violence of emotional distress that wives and girls batter their beaus with day after day, year after year, which ends in a divorce, early grave for the husband or lawsuit against the man. Females intentionally or recklessly inflict emotional pain on a man with words, intonation of voice, facial demeanor and acts or patterns of behavior, often over a long period of time. For example, every time a guy leaves the refrigerator door open for more than some arbitrarily time limit set by his girl, the domineering paragon of everything correct barks "shut the door!" Over time, opening the refrigerator can become an unpleasant task—not unlike touching a live wire. Or the reckless, maybe intentional keeping of letters from the wife's lover in a place for the husband to find them in order to shatter the world of a faithful husband, especially if her sexual escapades occurred in the year prior to the birth of a child. As



the genetically evil female well knows, a nauseating doubt will plague the husband until the day he dies that his child may not be his. What redress for the pain she caused would the husband have in feminism? None! In Russia, he could find some justice by slapping her around a bit, and if she called the cops, they'd help him out.

Girls have the advantage in America because physical violence is easy to prove: it leaves physical marks that a camera can record. Emotional violence, however, stalks the invisible world of the mind, which makes it a near perfect weapon. Husbands and boyfriends can't take pictures of the pain broads intentionally and recklessly cause them. Big Sister America is using that fact to tie men's hands, so they can no longer defend themselves against their girlfriends or wives twisting the blade of emotional pain through their hearts.

When will we see advertisements paid for by taxpayer dollars giving men a number to call to get some ragging, nagging, malicious broad to shut her yap? Not until science invents a technique for measuring emotional distress. Until then, a man has no choice but to follow Mother Nature, regardless of the cost, and slap the broad across the chops to stop the barrage of emotional bullets spewing from her tongue, which, of course, has always been a girl's gun.

posted by [admin](#) with [0 Comments](#)  
 Wednesday, July 05, 2006 4:43 PM

### A Different Time

A propeller driven plane drones somewhere overhead far out of sight. Its low monotone humming envelops a warm, spring Sunday afternoon somewhere in the 1950s. I sit on my 24 inch, black, single-gear Schwinn bicycle, keeping my balance by holding onto the door handle of an old, blue, four-door 1947 Dodge.

My consciousness pauses at the moment, feeling vaguely sad for no discernible reason. The week's events ended with this gift of nothing to do: no homework, no television shows, no new housing developments to explore or classmates able to come out and play.

The dead-end street needs a new asphalt topping. Where I am balance on the side, the asphalt has broken up into small gravel-like stones with an isolated weed sprouting up here and there. It is still early spring, the lawns are just beginning to turn green and the tulips and dogwood buds remain closed, waiting for a few consecutive days of warm weather. The air smells fresh, warmed slightly by a gentle breeze.

The droning airplane fills the vacuum of silence on this street with modest middle-class houses in this small suburban town, whose claim to fame will not come until the end of the next decade. Of all the towns in America, this town will have the second highest number of persons per capita to die in Vietnam—all of them men, of course, and all of them guys I knew.


posted by [admin](#) with [0 Comments](#)  
 Friday, May 12, 2006 3:21 PM

### Do Men Cause the Wars?

By Roy Den Hollander

During a trip to the evil empire—formerly the Soviet Union but still as evil as ever—a budding middle-aged Feminazi translator sternly ended her exposition about a battle depicted in a World War II museum outside Moscow with “Men cause the wars!” The American academicians and others along on the tour, including the males who were no longer men, nodded approvingly. Not me, my juvenile delinquent attitude, which I’ve never been able or wanted to outgrow, made me speak up. “Tell that to the guys pushing up daisies in the Falklands!” That shut the broad’s duplicitous mouth.

The Falklands, however, was just one war in which a female, Margaret Thatcher, helped kill 252 British and 655 Argentine soldiers, sailors, and airmen while doing in only three British females. What about all the other wars? Men certainly die in them in greater numbers than girls: the first Iraq war totaled about 22,000 men on both sides to 11 American female combat deaths and in Vietnam 58,185 American men to 8—that’s right—8 American females. But are guys the sole cause of that which destroys so many more men than broads? The National Organization of Witches (N.O.W.) and other



modern-day matriarchic tyrants would have us believe so because it infers that if men cause the wars, than they get what they deserve in war.

Letâ€™s look at the first Iraq war and April Glassby, the American ambassador to Iraq in 1990. She met Saddam Hussein just before he invaded Kuwait. At that time, there was rising tension between Iraq and Kuwait, Iraq was mobilizing and there were reports that Saddam might move across the border. So what did April tell Saddam at their meeting: the United States had no obligation to defend Kuwait. How dumb can you get! For dames it has no limits, especially in situations suited for men. Maybe April didnâ€™t want to offend Saddamâ€™s sensitivities by popping his illusion as the modern day Saladin. Whatever the reason for her stupidity, after April tells Saddam â€œgreen light,â€ he naturally invadesâ€ as would any guy when a girl gives him the go-aheadâ€ even though April probably meant â€œred light.â€ What was Saddam suppose to doâ€ read the bimboâ€™s mind? So he invades, figuring the U.S. wonâ€™t intervene because thatâ€™s what its ambassador said, and if the U.S. wonâ€™t than no one will.

As for Viet Nam, lots of contributing factors went into bringing us that war, including the 1.8 million more votes Lyndon Johnson received from females than men in 1964. Of course, those bimbos didnâ€™t swing the election and Barry Goldwater might have dragged us into the same quagmire, but just looking at history as it played-out shows that more girls than guys were responsible for re-electing LBJ who turned Viet Nam into a male meat grinder.


How about the big killer of menâ€ World War II? The war that prompted the bimbat Russian translator to blame only men. This requires a little historyâ€ something the Feminazis are excellent at ignoring or re-writing.

The treaty ending the First World War set up the League of Nations. In order for the League, like the United Nations today, to have any power required America as a member. The League ended up including most of Europe, including Germany, as well as Japan and Chinaâ€ but no U.S. Hereâ€™s why: President Woodrow Wilson and the leader of the Senate, Henry Cabot Lodge, had some disagreements over the League. Since the Senate would have to approve the treaty that called for U.S. membership, a compromise was crucial and likely because both men were politicians. But when Wilson suffered a stroke, his wife, in effect, took over as Presidentâ€ that doomed any chance of an agreement. When was the last time you tried to reach a compromise with a female? Itâ€™s not possible. To broods â€œcompromiseâ€ means only one thing: Do it their way! Without the U.S., the League ultimately proved incapable of preventing aggression by the Axis Powers in the 1930s, which culminated in World War II.

Another Mistress of War includes Queen Victoria with her campaigns of imperialism in Africa: the Anglo-Zulu War and the two Boer Wars. The Queen used 250,000 troops to conduct a scorched earth policy against the Boers and throw Africans and Boers into concentration camps: 27,927 Boers (of whom 22,074 were children under 16) and about 20,000 Africans died of starvation, disease and exposure. In all, about 25% of the Boer inmates and 17% of the African ones died. Concentration camps werenâ€™t new in 1900, but under the British matriarch Victoria, they wreaked an unprecedented toll of human misery. The Second Boer War alone cost around 75,000 lives â€ 22,000 British soldiers, 6,000-7,000 Boer soldiers, 20,000-28,000 Boer civilians and perhaps 25,000 Africans. The population of the world back then was 26% of what it is now, so multiply these figures by four to understand the scope of feminine barbarity.

Then thereâ€™s one of the all time Hoing champs: Catherine the Great of Russia. Ho Catherine started or instigated a number of wars in order to expand her domain to the South and East into the Ottoman Empire and bite off pieces of Poland in the West. Her eminence killed plenty men in order to add some 200,000 square miles to Russian territory, and when finished, she had bankrupted the county. The current German chancellor Angela Merkel has a picture of Catherine the Great in her office because, as Angela says, â€œCatherine was a strong woman,â€ which in Feminaziese means an unabashed Ho and destroyer of men.

There are plenty of other female tyrants throughout history who have unleashed the irrational fury of their twisted emotions when slighted, given vent to their insatiable greed and blown mindlessly passed





the chance of a compromise to kill plenty of men and others. The Feminazis conveniently ignored history hoping us guys will do the same and buy into their con of the empathetic female leader. Donâ€™t be fooled; broads are only empathetic so long as theyâ€™re looking in the mirror. The fighting and dying in wars will always fall on the shoulders of men, so it seems wise that to avoid unnecessary wars, there should keep bimbos out of the political decision making process.

posted by admin with 2 Comments

Friday, March 24, 2006 11:54 PM

Some Differences: Men v. Girls

Â© Roy Den Hollander, 2006

Feminazi propaganda claims that except for a few mounds of flesh and "gender" organs, there's basically no difference between men and girls. They say broads can do virtually anything men canâ€”perhaps, but can they do the tasks evolutionarily suited for men as well as men? Not in the real world they can't.


Would you waste time and money watching a bunch of broads trying to play basketball when you can catch a higher quality of ball played by men in college or the NBA? I don't think so. Of course, if the girls play in their tongs and halter tops, that's different. If you need someone to do your taxes, you'd be a fool to use a bimbo. Studies at Vanderbilt University show that thirteen times more boys than girls score above 700 on the math part of the SAT. Why risk going to jail because some feminazi ditz can't add? Or what about investing the money for which you had to put up with so much grief to earn in an economy where over 50% of the jobs are held by dames? Are you going to hand it over to some vain Feminazi such as the former CEO of Hewlett Packard who spent lots of company resources and time aggrandizing herself while the stock dropped 55%? On the other hand, when it comes to prostitution ringsâ€”invest with the sluts. Los Angeles recently busted the largest call girl operation in its history that had raked in five to eight million in just 22 months. It was run by broads: a 42 year-old Russian whore and her 22 year-old harlot daughter who is still on the lam. Money for sex-any broads natural calling.

But when it comes to the work Mother Nature made men for, girls don't cut it. So the next time some Feminazi gives you that stern, serious lookâ€”like the one your mother did when trying to tell you something that made no senseâ€”and says, "I'm a strong and independent woman," meaning she's as good and tough as a guy, ask her to step outside. "Excuse me!" She'll indignantly respond in a tone meant to intimidate. Reply with "I'm challenging you to a duel. Let's see how strong, independent and tough you really are. You can even choose the weapons, so long as they're not T and As or duplicity." That'll shut her yap.

Feminazi proselytizing even demands us to believe that girls are better suited for certain male activities-only the high paying and powerful ones of course-because broads are more compassionate and caring. Nobody wants a compassionate general, but let's see whether bimbos really are "compassionate." Take a husband and wife who both work. While driving, the wife slams into another car-not surprising since she's running her mouth on a cell phone and between breaths and gibberish, she's sucking down a coffee latte. She ends up in the hospital-good-for weeks. The family income is cut, but the husband's main concern is that she's okay and gets well. He knows they'll make it through the financial crunch. Reverse the situation. The husband is broadsided by some bimbo yakking on her cell phone and sipping a coffee latte. The accident, more like recklessness, sends him to the hospital for weeks. The wife's only concern is the impact on her of the loss of income and sex. Sex, unless she's an adulteress, which most wives are until men no longer find them attractive. While this example shows females as being less compassionate than men, it does show them as equals in one sense: both are primarily concerned about the wife.

Although girls are not as competent as men at many tasks; they aren't powerless. Mother Nature gave them the ability to use sex, sexual favors and sympathy to win what they want. But feminarchy America now allows them to habitually get away with conduct they never could have before. Feminazis believe the universe exempted them from civilized conduct by making them female even though that was just an accident.

Some examples: Has a girl ever summarily pushed you out of the way in a crowded night club or in a stampede to squeeze her fat ass into a bus or subway spot that could fit only one of her cheeks? What



about cutting in line or mouthing off in such a vitriolic manner that if it came from a man he'd end up with a knuckle sandwich? Then there's murdering her children without getting fried, killing her husband and not even going to jail or butchering incipient human beings on demand because she wants the choice to act irresponsibly in satisfying her sexual whim of the moment?

Feminarchy America allows broads to get away with more than Mother Nature intended, not because girls are superior but because females are now making the rules. We have forgotten six million years of hominid evolution: dames aren't here to soothe the "savage beast"; the "savage beast" is here to limit broads' infinite capacity for evil. And the most virulent feminine evil is the Feminazis.

So what's to be done with a Feminazi? Strap her to a missile and drop her it on the Middle East . They'll know how to deal with her.

posted by [admin](#) with [0 Comments](#)

